

REMARKS:

In the Office Action the Examiner noted that claims 1, 3-11, 13 and 14 are pending in the application, and the Examiner rejected all claims.

By this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 13 and 14 have been amended. Claims 2 and 12 remain cancelled. No new matter has been presented.

Thus, claims 1, 3-11, 13 and 14 are pending in the application. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below, and reconsideration of all rejected claims is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §102:

In item 6 on page 3 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1-11, 13, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,205,478 (Sugano). The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections of the remaining claims.

Claim 1, by way of example, recites "extracting a part of information of watcher clients of the first client to be one or more identifier notification recipients according to the change of the identifier of the first client" and "... replacing identifiers of all watcher clients with one or more identifiers of the extracted identifier notification recipients." Applicants respectfully submit that Sugano does not disclose or suggest at least this feature of claim 1. See also claims 10, 11, 13 and 14 reciting similar features.

In contrast to extracting "a part of information of watcher clients", Sugano discusses a feature according to which the new identifier of the first client is notified to all recipients to which the UIO of the first client was sent in the past. This is clear from the following description in Sugano which the examiner also cited in the office action:

"When changes are made in user information... an update notification is transmitted to each of the user terminals.... corresponding to receiving users who previously received a corresponding transmitted UIO."

(see, col.18, lines.10-14 of Sugano)

As can be seen from the above discussion, Sugano does not teach or suggest "a part of information of watcher clients", as taught by the claimed invention. For the above-discussed reason, the Examiner does not appear to have established a priori case of anticipation. For this reason it is requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

That is, the claimed invention enables designation of those ("a part of information of watcher clients of the first client to be one or more identifier notification recipients") that are to

receive information of an update. There is no such teaching in Sugano.

In fact, when considering Sugano in its entirety, i.e., as a whole, Sugano teaches away from the claimed invention according to which only a part of the watchers will receive the new identifier of the first client. As mentioned above, Sugano includes teachings that would lead away from the claimed invention since Sugano discusses updating information of all user terminals (recipients) upon detection of a changed in user information.

Therefore, Sugano does not teach or suggest each and every element of the Applicants' independent claims. In order for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach each and every element of the claim (MPEP §2131). Therefore, since Sugano does not disclose the features recited in the independent claims, as stated above, it is respectfully submitted that the independent claims patentably distinguish over Sugano, and withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection is earnestly and respectfully solicited.

Claims depending from the independent claims include all of the features of that claim plus additional features which are not disclosed by Sugano. For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from the independent claims are patentably distinguishable over Sugano. The dependent claims are also independently patentable.

For example, claim 4 recites, "storing a notification history of the presence information" and "said extracting including extracting at least one of a plurality of watcher clients of the first client based on the notification history, and deciding to be one or more identifier notification recipients." In contrast, Sugano discusses transmitting updates based on all recipients of the UIOs.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION:

By this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 13 and 14 have been amended. Claims 2 and 12 remain cancelled. Thus, claims 1, 3-11, 13 and 14 are pending in the application.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance.

An early action to that effect is courteously solicited. Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

By: 
Tennit Afework
Registration No. 58,202

Date: 09/08/2009
1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501